



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,043	11/09/1998	SCOTT M. ROCKLAGE	238/117	5059
21834	7590	11/02/2005	EXAMINER	
BECK AND TYSVER P.L.L.C. 2900 THOMAS AVENUE SOUTH SUITE 100 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55416			HARTLEY, MICHAEL G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1618		

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/189,043	ROCKLAGE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael G. Hartley	1618

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

(1) Michael G. Hartley.

(3) _____.

(2) Mark Litman (App. repr.).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
none
Claims discussed:
none
Prior art documents discussed:
none
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Litman to inform him that the amendment to the specification directed to " related applications data" (continuing data) filed 3/7/2005 was improper since it attempted to claim a later filed application, for example, 09/322,042 as a continuation-in-part, and a later filed application cannot be any type of continuing case. It was agreed upon to cancel the "related application data" of 3/7/2005 and use the continuing data of the amendment filed 11/9/1998 which is correct.